

Dear Jim,

9/8/72

Your letter of Saturday, not postmarked until Tuesday, came yesterday. I read it then, with a number of interruptions that killed most of the day for me. I'll respond in haste before today presses down.

As I predicted, I've not heard from Ivon. Unless they have reason to believe they will call on me for help, or Jim sees an ego trip, or Ivon decides to do something on his own, I do not expect to. However, when next you are there if you verely offer to copy these transcripts for me, he may let you do it. The alternative will be to say he doesn't want me to have them. That may be a bit embarrassing. I am reasonably certain that of the two more obvious probabilities, he is following Jim's orders. I also wrote Jim to be sure he knew. That letter has not been returned. But don't make a deal of it. If I don't get them it will probably be better for me personally. I can't keep up with what I'm into now.

However, he has sent me but the single transcript, the first in which "lein appeared before Christenberry.

I don't think Boxley was then working for the government. I think he fed back what Jim invented and wanted to be true.

If as Ivon says "in is fighting for his future, he sees his future as I can't. As a judge he is immobilized. As DA he has some heft and some means of defending himself.

"Pandora's Box" would be that for us. There never was anything that could be called a real investigation there. Publishing any of it would be a disaster. "in is kidding himself and others if he thinks publishing the kind of crap I saw has any worth. I think he has no such intention. If he came up with anything significantly new about the assassination, it is still secret from me. Except for Shaw, which is uniquely his, I can trace even his wilder guff to another source. So, if you are interested in going over foolishness and futility in which there might be a few worthwhile crumbs, don't be disappointed if the result does not survive critical analysis. Helping in the campaign is another matter.

How can you write a decent thing on the "probe" when there really was none? Even the decent leads were never followed up. It was all a disappation of great effort from which not even good fiction emerged. That is the tragedy.

You ask why I call Flamonde a whore. A whore seels herself. That is what Flamonde did in that stupid sycophancy pretended to be something else.

Wecht has added nothing but confusion and has succeeded in misallocating responsibility for the suppressions. His projected panel is, by his design, to examine only that which has no established relevance to the solution of the crime. It would have the added effect of jinning more firmly on Kennedys what the Hoovers and Commission lawyers did. The family had nothing to do with suppression. Cyril is off on an ego kick he probably hopes will benefit him professionally. esp. his malpractice business (he takes such cases and can't advertise for them). He began with me alone with apprehensions. He wound up with no single responsible critic supporting him. If I forecast long ago what the result of his examination would be (not that he ^{would take} ~~take~~ credit for discovering the single-bullet theory's invalidity, which is like claiming to discover sex or invent the wheel), I had expected him to be more professional. If he has some goodies he is saving for an article in some professional rag, I expect nothing new from him.

I don't think there is the possibility of a new investigation or the possibility that if there were to be it could be honest without prior publication of sufficient probative evidence, all put together in advance, to preclude crookedness.

Thanks for taking the time. I encourage you to hold it cool and concentrate on getting yourself a decent job. Except for involvement in political activities, I don't think you can now do anything you could later look back upon with personal satisfaction.

Best,